



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

hardly be explained in the simple way suggested by Jaisle (p. 4). It is quite possible that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in this matter, as elsewhere, show us only one phase of current thought, and that the belief in the Dioscuri as general protectors and helpers may have developed at a period anterior to the Homeric epics, although it was hardly inherited from the "Indo-european period." On this point Jaisle should have consulted not Myrianthus, but Charles Reuel, *L'évolution d'un mythe, Aëvins et Dioscures*, Paris, 1896—a book from which he could have learned much. Nor should he have neglected Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, 50, 207–15.

The paucity of dedications to the Dioscuri in their special office is striking. Jaisle gives three Greek inscriptions (*IG*, IV, 1279; VII, 1826; XIV, 2461), all of the Roman period; the two Latin (*CIL*, VI, 413; XIII, 3026) are not certainly to the point.

So far as the second part of this dissertation is concerned it had better not have been written. There is no proof that the martyrs Castor and Pollux, or the saints Castor of Coblenz, Polyuctus of Melitene, and Phocas of Sinope (who is related to Priapus!) have anything to do with the Castor and Pollux of pagan legend and belief. On the other hand, Peter and Paul in Naples inherited certain functions of the Dioscuri with their temple—Peter opening, Paul closing the floodgates of heaven.

The long delay in noticing this dissertation has been due in large measure to an oversight on the part of the reviewer, for which he would express his regret.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

Xenophontis Scripta minora. Fasciculus posterior opuscula politica equestria venatica continens post Ludovicum Dindorf edidit FRANCISCUS RUEHL. Accedunt Simonis De re equestri quae supersunt. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.

Of the six essays of Xenophon contained in this volume we now have three at least, the *Hipparchus*, the *Cynegeticus*, and the *De re equestri*, in a much less corrupt form than when the first Teubner edition appeared. This is due to the rediscovery by Ruehl of the Codex Vaticanus Graecus 989 (V), which contains all three and is far superior to those previously used, and to the finding of Codex Vindobonensis iv, 34 (W), containing the *Cynegeticus* and the *De re equestri*, an authority reckoned superior even to V. On the basis of these two codices, together with the inferior class, a group of Italian scholars, Cerocchi, Tommasini, and Pierleoni, have published in the Weidmann press separate editions of the *Hipparchus* (1901), the *De re equestri* (1902), and the *Cynegeticus* (1902), which have received the unanimous praise of the reviewers. Pierleoni has also given us an excellent edition of the *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum* (1906). The *De vectigalibus*, then, is the only one of the six which has not recently been given the dignity of a separate

edition,¹ the *Respublica Atheniensium*, of course, having received abundant attention, the last edition being that of Kalinka (1898).

The present volume gives us all six together in handy form and adds the *De re equestri* of Simon. The editor, Fr. Ruehl, has been known as a student of Xenophon for more than thirty years. He has made new collations of the principal MSS and many others have been placed at his disposal. His own labors, aided by the editions just referred to, have given us a reliable critical apparatus and as satisfactory a text as we are likely to have. A full and well-selected list of conjectural emendations accompanies the variant readings.

In the *Respublica Atheniensium* Ruehl has gone farther than Kalinka in inserting emendations in the text. This course is defensible where, as is so often the case here, it is perfectly clear what the writer intended to say, and the text is unreadable without the insertions. It is perhaps unfortunate that the same brackets are used for insertions (1) that merely restore the sense, without the exact words being attainable, for those (2) where the exact words are supplied by the context, and for those (3) which are given by Codex Mutinensis, though Ruehl is no doubt right in denying to that Codex the authority given it by Kalinka.

As between V and W, Ruehl does not hold the latter so highly as Pierleoni and Tommasini. It is difficult to approve his course in the proemium of the *Cynegeticus*, which is lacking in V, and in which the inferior MSS contain several passages not found in W. Ruehl does not here follow W. However, a decision based upon one's critical judgment of the inserted sentences rather than upon the relative value of the MSS is particularly difficult in a chapter of such peculiar style as this one. Ruehl, by the way, nowhere in this edition expresses his opinion upon the Xenophontine authorship either of the *Respublica Atheniensium* or of the first and last chapters of the *Cynegeticus*. Elsewhere he has taken the conservative point of view.

A. G. LAIRD

M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes (Cum senatui gratias egit; Cum populo gratias egit; De domo sua; De haruspicum responso; Pro Sestio; In Vatinius; De provinciis consularibus; Pro Balbo). Recognovit brevique Adnotatione Critica Instruxit GVLIELMVS PETERSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Pp. 306. 2s. 6d., paper; 3s. 6d., cloth.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes (Pro Tullio; Pro Fonteio; Pro Sulla; Pro Archia; Pro Plancio; Pro Scauro). Recognovit brevique Adnotatione Critica Instruxit ALBERTVS CVRTIS CLARK. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Pp. 188. 2s., paper; 2s. 6d., cloth.

Principal Peterson gives in the short introduction to his volume a very brief history of the critical battle that has raged about the four orations—

¹ Pierleoni has included this with two or three of the others in an Italian edition.